

4



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,572	03/31/2004	Hong Zhou	0026-0080	4333

44989 7590 04/02/2007  
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP  
11350 Random Hills Road  
SUITE 600  
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER
----------

BELL, CORY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/813,572

Applicant(s)

ZHOU ET AL.

Examiner

Cory C. Bell

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 have been examined.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 14-6, 18-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6006225, known hereafter as Bowman patented 12/21/1999.

3. *As per Claim 1*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

1. A method, comprising: receiving a search query;{Col 3 lines 5-9} determining whether the received search query includes an entity name;{Col 6 lines 59-64} determining whether the entity name corresponds to one of a plurality of common words or phrases; {Col 6 line 64- Col 7 line 5 and col 7 lines 24-33} selectively rewriting the received search query based on whether the entity name is determined to be correspond to the one of a plurality of common words or phrases;{Figure 7 shows if there are no terms in the correlation table then no rewrite is performed, Figure 9 also shows the rewrite be selectable as well} performing a search based on the received search query or the rewritten search query to obtain search results; and presenting the search results{Figure 9}.

4. *As per Claim 2*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

2. The method of claim 1, further comprising: providing a link to the received search query when,

Art Unit: 2164

the search is performed based on the rewritten search query. {Figure 9 shows the rewritten query being accessed through a link from to original query, it is inherent that those results would have a link back to the received search query via the back button}

5. *As per Claim 3*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

3. The method of claim 2, further comprising: receiving selection of the link to the received search query; and performing a search based on the received search query. {Figure 9}

6. *As per Claim 4*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

4. The method of claim 1, further comprising: providing a link to the rewritten search query when the search is performed based on the received search query. {Figure 9}

7. *As per Claim 5*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

5. The method of claim 4, further comprising: receiving selection of the link to the rewritten search query; and performing a search based on the rewritten search query. {Figure 9, Col 14 lines 13-23}

8. *As per Claim 7*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

7. The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the entity name is associated with a common word or phrase comprises: comparing the entity name to a dictionary of words or phrases. {Figure 7, Figure 5A}

9. *As per Claim 9*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

9. The method of claim 1, wherein determining whether the entity name is associated with a common word or phrase comprises: generating a table of entity names that are associated with common words or phrases, and determining whether the entity name is associated with a common word or phrase based on the table. {Figure 5a, Col 2 lines 47-63}

Art Unit: 2164

10. *As per Claim 14*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

See Claim 1 rejection.

11. *As per Claim 15*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

See Claim 2 rejection.

12. *As per Claim 16*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

See Claim 3 rejection.

13. *As per Claim 18*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

18. A method, comprising: determining a plurality of entity names; determining whether each of the entity names is associated with a common word or phrase; {See Claim 1 rejection} and generating a table of the entity names that are associated with common words or phrases. {Col 2 lines 47-63}

14. *As per Claim 19*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

19. The method of claim 18, wherein determining whether each of the entity names is associated with a common word or phrase comprises: comparing each of the entity names to a dictionary of words or phrases. {See Claim 7 rejection}

15. *As per Claim 21*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

See Claim 18 rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2164

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 6, 8, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of “The Use of external Knowledge in Faction QA” published 11/2001, known hereafter as Hovy .

17. *As per claims 6 and 20,*

Bowman teaches the claims upon which claims 6 and 20 are dependant, and performing a received search and providing links to alternate searches, but Bowman fails to expressly disclose “determining whether a word near the entity name in the received search query forms a common phrase with the entity name” and using the phrase to rewrite a query. This feature, however, is taught in Hovy Section 3 under expanding queries. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature as it would provide a further option to improve the users query.

18. *As per claim 8 ,*

Bowman teaches the claims upon which claim 8 is dependant, but Bowman fails to expressly disclose “using a linguistic modeling technique” to determine associations. This feature, however, is taught in Hovy Section “Semantic Relation Matching in Webclopedia”. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature as it would provide a further option to improve the users query.

19. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of US 20040225681, known hereafter as Chaney.

20. *As per claim 11,*

Art Unit: 2164

Bowman teaches the claims upon which claim 11 is dependant, but Bowman fails to expressly disclose determining variation of the entity names. This feature, however, is taught in Chaney para 134. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature as it would provide to improve the users query.

21. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman

*As per Claim 12*, Bowman teaches the limitations as follows:

12. The method of claim 1, wherein performing a search comprises: searching based on the received search query when the entity name is determined to be associated with a common word or phrase. {See Figure 9} *Bowman does not expressly disclose that act of doing this automatically however making the manual process automatic would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention See In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) and MPEP 2144.04 [R-1] III*

22. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of US 5640553, known hereafter as Schultz.

*As per claim 13*,

Bowman teaches the claims upon which claim 13 is dependant, but Bowman fails to expressly disclose rewriting a query when the entity name cannot be expanded. This feature, however, is taught in Sultz Figure 6b which teaches doing semantic expansion of terms that are not proper nouns. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature, as it would provide to improve the users query. Bowman does

Art Unit: 2164

not expressly disclose that act of doing this automatically however making the manual process automatic would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention *See In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) and MPEP 2144.04 [R-1] III*

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of Google Hacks, published February 2003. Bowman Teaches all limitations of claim 17 except “the rewritten query including a restrict identifier that restricts a search associated with the rewritten search domain associate with the entity name.” However this is taught on page 54 of Google Hacks. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature as it provides the advantage of providing new search results and cached pages that are no longer available on the site itself.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 22 is allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Any argument not repeated have been withdrawn in light of applicants amendments,

With regards to applicant’s argument that Bowman fails to teach determining whether a received search contains an entity name, the applicant is incorrect as author’s names, artist’s names, and label names are all entity names.



Art Unit: 2164

not expressly disclose that act of doing this automatically however making the manual process automatic would have been well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention *See In re Venner, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958) and MPEP 2144.04 [R-1] III*

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowman in view of Google Hacks, published February 2003. Bowman Teaches all limitations of claim 17 except “the rewritten query including a restrict identifier that restricts a search associated with the rewritten search domain associate with the entity name.” However this is taught on page 54 of Google Hacks. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature as it provides the advantage of providing new search results and cached pages that are no longer available on the site itself.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 22 is allowed.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Any rejections not repeated have been withdrawn in light of applicant's amendments.

With regards to applicant's argument that Bowman fails to teach determining whether a received search contains an entity name, the applicant is incorrect as author's names, artist's names, and label names are all entity names.

Art Unit: 2164

With regards to applicant's argument that Bowman fails to teach determining whether an entity name corresponds to one of a plurality of common words or phrases the applicant is incorrect this limitation as amended is taught by the newly cited portion of Bowman in the rejection of claim 1 above.

With regards to applicant's argument for claim 7, the applicant is incorrect as the correlation table of Bowman is a dictionary of words or phrases using the broadest reasonable interpretation.

With regards to applicants arguments for claim 9 the applicant is incorrect. Applicant claims that Bowman fails to disclose the related terms are entity names that correspond to common words or phrase, however Figure 5a clearly includes entity names, for example, HUFFY, CARLSON, YATES, WAGNER, GARRET ect.

Applicant's arguments for claims 6, 8, 11; 13, 14, and 18-21 are not-persuasive as they rely upon the arguments of claim 1 addressed above.

Applicant's arguments for claim 17 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

This Office action has an attached requirement for information under 37 CFR 1.105. A complete reply to this Office action must include a complete reply to the attached requirement for information. The time period for reply to the attached requirement coincides with the time period for reply to this Office action.

The office action has been made non-final to allow for the full consideration of applicants reply to the requirement for information.


Art Unit: 2164

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cory Bell

  
**CHARLES RONES**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

***Requirement of Information***

Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application.

In response to this requirement, please provide answers to each of the following interrogatories eliciting factual information:

Please provide identification of any use of the claimed invention known to any of the inventors at the time the application was filed and the date of the use. (See 37 CFR 1.105(a)(1)(vii))

The applicant is reminded that the reply to this requirement must be made with candor and good faith under 37 CFR 1.56. Where the applicant does not have or cannot readily obtain an item of required information, a statement that the item is unknown or cannot be readily obtained may be accepted as a complete reply to the requirement for that item.

In responding to those requirements that require copies of documents, where the document is a bound text or a single article over 50 pages, the requirement may be met by providing copies of those pages that provide the particular subject matter indicated in the requirement, or where such subject matter is not indicated, the subject matter found in applicant's disclosure.

The fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this requirement. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 that are included in the applicant's first complete

Art Unit: 2164

communication responding to this requirement. Any supplemental replies subsequent to the first communication responding to this requirement and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this requirement under 37 CFR 1.105 are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR 1.97.

This requirement is an attachment of the enclosed Office action. A complete reply to the enclosed Office action must include a complete reply to this requirement. The time period for reply to this requirement coincides with the time period for reply to the enclosed Office action.

Cory Bell

  
**CHARLES RONES**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**